

73

The Japanese Question A Symposium

Edited by K. K. KAWAKAMI

名 米
士 國

日
米
問
題
觀

Published by
The Japanese-American News

340 Mason St., San Francisco, Cal.

10 Cents a Copy

CONTENTS.

1. Introductory Remarks.

By K. K. Kawakami,
Author of "American-Japanese Relations," "Asia
at the Door," etc.

2. Eye to Eye.

By Benjamin Ide Wheeler,
President University of California.

3. Japan and the United States.

By Ray Lyman Wilbur,
President Leland Stanford Junior University.

4. The Japanese Question in America.

By Walter Macarthur,
Shipping Commissioner for San Francisco.

5. California and the Japanese.

By George Malcolm Stratton,
Professor of Psychology, University of California.

6. The United States and Japan.

By James W. Mullen,
Editor "Labor Clarion," San Francisco.

7. What the West Might Learn From Japan.

By George Kennan.

8. America and Japan—War or Peace.

By Jefferson Jones,
Editor "Minneapolis Journal" and Author of "The
Fall of Tsing Tau."

9. The Japanese Question in America.

By Carlos K. McClatchy,
Editor "Sacramento Bee," Sacramento, Cal.

10. Treaty Obligations.

By Hon. Elihu Root,
Ex-Secretary of State, ex-United States Senator.

11. Lest We Forget.

By John Foord.

12. The Pacific Coast Peril.

By Francis Butler Loomis,
Former Assistant Secretary of State.

13. The Japanese Question in the United States.

By William T. Bonsor,
Secretary Anti-Japanese Laundry League.

14. America and Race Problem.

By the Rev. C. F. Aked, D.D., LL. D.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

The articles in the following pages were originally published in the New Year's edition of the Japanese American Daily News. They have been so highly commended that we think it worth while to preserve them in pamphlet form. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the generosity of our friends who favored us with articles. We are also indebted to Mr. Lindsey Russell and Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, editor and publishers, respectively, of the book "America to Japan" for the permission to reprint a few articles from that book.—The Japanese American News.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

By K. K. Kawakami.

Author of "American-Japanese Relations," "Asia at the Door," etc.

It is with great pleasure that we present in this issue of the Japanese American Daily News a symposium of views on American-Japanese relations, and more especially on the question, if question it may be called, of the Japanese in America. We take occasion to thank our American friends who have so promptly and generously responded to our request and favored us with statements which we believe are as frank as they are sincere.

In writing the following introductory remarks it is not my intention to criticise or dispute the views expressed by our contributors. We presume, however, that our American friends and critics are just as desirous to know our views on the question as we are anxious to hear their opinion. We believe in free and unreserved exchange of views as a means of establishing mutual understanding. No question can be settled right without presenting both sides of the case before the tribunal of public opinion. What I am going to say in the following few paragraphs, therefore, is simply to let our American friends know how we feel about the question, not to enter into any controversy with them.

Immigration and Naturalization.

And now we come to our main contention. We shall say at once that in so far as we are able to see, the Japanese Government does not intend to force emigration upon the United States. In 1907 the Mikado's Government, in deference to the wish of the American Government, signed the so-called gentlemen's agreement restricting most strictly Japanese immigration to these shores. I have no hesitation in saying that Japan intends indefinitely to continue the gentlemen's agreement.

On this point I think that Mr. Jefferson Jones in his article, presented elsewhere in this issue, sets forth a view not only interesting but thought-provoking. What Japan is after, he says, is not emigration but recognition—recognition as a member of the comity of civilized powers. Canada and Australia restrict Japanese immigration more strictly than does the United States. And yet the Japanese have not protested against them half as strongly as they have protested against

this country. Why? Because, in Mr. Jones' judgment, Great Britain has fully recognized Japan's progress and achievements as a civilized power by dealing with her on a plane of equality, by entering into alliance with her, and thus saved Japan's face.

Moreover Canada extends citizenship to the Japanese, and has always permitted both the naturalized and alien Japanese to own land. In most provinces the Japanese even enjoy the franchise.

Mr. Jones' contention furnishes food for reflection. Suppose that the United States asked Japan to continue the gentlemen's agreement indefinitely on the one hand, and on the other hand saved Japan's face by extending citizenship to the small number of the Japanese already domiciled in this country. Mr. Jones fears that such a course may compel the United States to extend the same privilege to all Asiatics. In reply to this we say that the United States need not extend to countries not yet admitted into the family of civilized powers the privileges which she has conferred upon the subjects or citizens of a country which has been recognized in the concourse of the nations as a first-class power. Do not jump into the conclusion that the Japanese are cocky and bumptious. We are keenly alive to our shortcomings and defects which we have not permitted the halo of our achievements to obscure. And yet we hope that our American critics will give us credit for what we have accomplished in the brief period of fifty years, and recognize that Japan is the only nation in Asia imbued with modern civilization.

Mr. Carlos K. McClatchy, of the Sacramento Bee, in his article printed in this number, says that the Japanese should not ask for citizenship. We know as well as Mr. McClatchy that naturalization is a privilege which should be granted only by the will of the American Government, not upon the demand of any alien government or people. That is why we hope that sooner or later—better sooner than later—the American Government and people will come to look upon the question in the light of broader international relations. If there be in international dealings such a thing as courtesy, we hope that the United States will not forget to adhere to its common dictates.

The granting of naturalization to Orientals is so radical a departure from the fixed idea of America that most people are highly skeptical of it. But if a future historian, ages after our departure from this world, were to chronicle the

events that are happening today, he would no doubt wonder why there was so much ado about the naturalization of the Japanese in America. The course of history is tortuous. It abounds in many backward bends and many reflux eddies. Man is essentially conservative. He does not easily abandon the old and adopt the new. When the British populace began to clamor for popular rights, those so-called upper classes who held the kingdom in the hollows of their hands lifted hands in holy horror and condemned the masses as though they had committed the foulest crime in demanding liberty and human rights. So it is with all innovations.

Hawaii and California.

It is important to note the difference between the situation in Hawaii and the situation in California or on the Pacific Coast. Some critics point to Hawaii as an example of Orientalization of the American soil, and warns that California should not become a second Hawaii. The fact is that California will never become a second Hawaii, even if she wanted to become such, because the conditions prevailing here are radically different from those in Hawaii. To be convinced of this it is only necessary to know something of the history of the sugar industry in the islands. To begin with, Hawaii was not a white man's land; it was inhabited by dark-skinned semi-civilized natives. And when the white men secured the privilege to exploit its natural resources they brought by the shipload all sorts of Oriental labour for the sugar plantations. The country had neither the white population nor "white civilization" when the planters began to import Oriental laborers.

The conditions on the Pacific Coast are totally different. Here American civilization and the Caucasian population have been so firmly established that Japanese immigration, so strictly checked by the gentlemen's agreement, cannot possibly become a danger.

Nor can argument advanced against Chinese immigration prior to the enactment of the Chinese exclusion laws be applied to the Japanese immigration of today. The Chinese immigration from 1854 to 1882 totalled 139,455, the overwhelming majority of which came to and remained in California. In view of the fact that in the seventies of the past century when agitation for Chinese exclusion was begun, the state of California had a population of only 560,000, including negroes, Indians, and Chinese, the apprehension that the Chinese might hinder the wholesome

growth of the white community in the state was not without ground. But the conditions on the Pacific Coast have since radically changed, while circumstances attendant upon Japanese immigration are widely different from those accompanying Chinese immigration. In 1900 the white population of California increased to 1,402,727, and in 1910 to 2,259,672. It is difficult to ascertain the number of the Japanese in the state. The census of 1910 places it at 41,356. While this seems to be a conservative estimate, it is perhaps no more conservative than the number given for the white population. Perhaps the common estimate which places the number of Japanese at 60,000 is not far from the mark, although much of it consists of floating elements contemplating to return to Japan or, to a lesser extent, to move to other states. This number will probably remain stationary if it does not materially decrease, because of the fact that the gap left by departing Japanese will be filled by children born of Japanese parents in the state.

With the gentlemen's agreement strictly enforced, with Americans flowing into California from eastern states in ever increasing streams, with the opening of the Panama Canal stimulating European immigration, there is no reason why California should apprehend the "Orientalization" of the state.

Let me be frank and say that America ought to be thankful that she finds in Japan an efficient government to deal with in the adjustment of the immigration question. The Tokio Government has been handling the matter so effectively and skillfully and honestly that no Japanese has ever been smuggled into these shores. With the recent sensational story of the smuggling of Chinese before us, have not the people of California reason to be glad that the Federal Government, in dealing with Japan, is not dealing with such an inefficient Government as that of China?

Not only is the Japanese Government restricting immigration to the United States but it is most carefully restricting emigration to Mexico and Canada. In spite of all the insinuations which the sensational journals of this country are publishing with regard to the alleged Japanese activities in Mexico there are only 3,400 or 4,000 Japanese in all Mexico, and the number is fast decreasing because of the chaotic political condition in that country. The story of Japanese designs upon Magdalena Bay and Turtle Bay is a

crime deliberately committed by certain newspapers in this country for the purpose of stirring up ill-feeling between Japan and the United States.

The Picture Bride.

And now let me touch upon the question of the "picture bride." The picture bride cannot be understood without understanding the marriage institution of Japan. When I heard Dr. William Elliot Griffis, perhaps the greatest American authority on Japan, say that of all the nations of the world the Japanese alone has for centuries practiced the principle of eugenics. I thought he was joking. But he propounded the theory so convincingly that I had to change my mind somewhat. He emphasized the immense amount of pains and care which the Japanese parents take in looking into the genealogy, character, education, health and what not of the young man or young girl who is to be the life companion of their daughter or son. Japan is the country where Cupid is not permitted to give full play to his whims and wiles. To the Japanese parents marriage is the most serious business. Apart from the question whether marriage, unaccompanied by courtship shrouded in the glamour of love and poetry and romance, is really worth contracting, we must concede that the marriage institution in Japan is strongly tinged with the rationalism of modern civilization. Personally, I am not sure that I prefer such rational marriage to the romantic marriage prevalent in the West, for I am blessed with frailties common to humanity, but that need not change my general view. The point is that the picture bride is simply the product of the time-honored eugenic, rational marriage-institution of Japan. I don't mean to recommend this sort of marriage to my American friends, but to the Japanese the institution seems satisfactory and salutary.

The Problem Economic and Racial.

I am glad to hear Mr. Mullen and Mr. Macarthur tell us that the Japanese question is primarily and essentially an economic problem. If it be so it would be the part of wisdom on the part of organized labor to open its doors to Japanese workers and admit them into its membership, or permit the Japanese labor unions to affiliate with the central labor organizations of America. This will establish the same wage scale both for the Japanese and for American workers, and thus eliminate competition.

On the other hand there are men who regard it as a

race problem, and who discuss the question from the point of view of intermarriage. Let me say at once that California need not have the slightest apprehension on the matter of intermarriage between Japanese and Caucasians. In the first place cases of such intermarriage will always be very few. The Japanese are proud of their blood no less than the Americans are proud of their blood. The mixture of blood in the south is the outcome of brute passions of the white taskmasters vented upon helpless slave women, who were nothing but their chattels and who had not the slightest sense of human dignity. Such a condition does not apply to California.

No, Japanese and American blood will not mix to any appreciable extent. The few cases of intermarriage which may occur here and there need excite no apprehension, for the average offspring of Japanese-American union is as bright, intelligent, handsome, and lovable as the average American or Caucasian child. If such offsprings were mentally deficient or homely in appearance, that would of course make a world of difference. But inasmuch as they are pretty and bright as any child the stork has ever brought to light, there is no reason why intermarriage should be objected to. I am fully aware that because of the age-long prejudice against intermarriage the children of Japanese-American parentage will more or less have to suffer social disadvantages. But they will suffer no greater disadvantage than have been suffered by all other pioneers in a new field. And their suffering will be richly rewarded, for when they have proved their worth and virtue they shall have conquered a world-wide prejudice. If they are comely in appearance, if they are respectable in demeanor, if they are well educated, the rest will take care of itself; neither Dame California nor Madame Columbia need worry about their future. This is not a dogmatic assertion but a conclusion based upon substantial facts and evidence.

The degree of disadvantage which the Japanese-American children may experience can best be gauged by observing if American children, i. e., children in whose veins runs nothing but the Caucasian blood, instinctively play with them and easily become their whole-hearted friends. If the Japanese-American children find difficulty in making friends of American children, their disadvantage in life will be great. My observations convince me that the children of respectable Japanese men and American women are readily accepted and

welcomed by other children, either at school or in the neighborhood in which they live. What is still more important, experience has shown that they have no difficulty in marrying Caucasians.

The admixture of Japanese and American blood will take place in eastern States rather than in California. California's game is the game of the ostrich who buries his head in the sand and thinks he is safe from the gun of the hunter.

Spencer on Race Fusion.

Those who object to intermarriage of Japanese and Caucasian refer to Herbert Spencer's biological and sociological theories. Pity the man who has not kept abreast with the rapid progress of science and think that Spencer's is the last word on the question! In many respects Spencer is no longer the authority. He has had his day, but his light has been dimmed by the greater stars that have risen.

For the sake of the Spencer-worshipper, however, let me quote the following from his *Principles of Sociology*:

"From their (nearly allied peoples') fusion results a community which, determined in its leading traits by the character common to the two, and prevented by their differences of character from being determined in its minor traits—is left capable of taking on new arrangements wrought by new influences; medium plasticity allows those changes of structure constituting advance in heterogeneity. One example is furnished us by the Hebrews; who, notwithstanding their boasted purity of blood, resulted from a mixing of many Semitic varieties in the country east of the Nile, and who, both in their wanderings and after the conquest of Palestine, went on amalgamating kindred tribes. Another is supplied by Athensans, whose progress had for antecedent the mingling of numerous immigrants from other Greek states with the Greeks of the locality. The fusion by conquest of the Romans with other Aryan tribes, Sabini, Sabelli and Samnites, preceded the first ascending stage of the Roman civilization. And our own country, peopled by different divisions of the Aryan race, and mainly by varieties of Scandinavians, illustrates this effect produced by the mixture of units sufficiently alike to co-operate in the same social system, but sufficiently unlike to prevent that social system from becoming forthwith definite in structure."

I think that this theory can very well be applied to the admixture of Japanese and Caucasian blood. Mentally and physically the Japanese and Caucasians are not so radically

different as to cause racial degeneration in the event of their mingling. When Spencer penned the above theory he did not know the Japanese. The few Japanese whom he had a glimpse of wore a topknot and were garbed in exotic costumes of feudal Japan, which made them appear all too different from the Caucasian race to be comprehended by the Westerner. Had Spencer lived till this day and enjoyed the advantages resulting from modern scientific investigations, he would have had something more definite to say about the Japanese.

Much amateur view has been advanced as to the biological aspect of intermarriage. For example, some people attribute the present unhappy condition of Mexico to the admixture of Spanish and native blood. This is tommy rot. If the Mexicans enjoyed the advantage of modern educational system and basked in the blessings of an efficient government they would be just as efficient and keen as the other Latin American people. It is not the mixture of blood but corrupt political system and bad social environment which are responsible for their degradation. Let us listen to what Francis Lieber has to say on this point:

“It is one of the greatest blessings to live under wise laws administered by an upright government and obeyed and carried out by good and staunch citizens; it is most grateful and animating to a generous heart, and a mind which cheerfully assists in the promotion of the general good, or salutary institutions. It greatly contributes to our self-esteem if we live in a community which we respect, among fellow-men we gladly acknowledge as fellow-citizens. Many of the noblest actions which now adorn the pages of history have originated from this course of inspiration. On the contrary, we feel ourselves humbled, dispirited, we find our own views contracted and our moral vigor relaxed, we feel deprived of that buoyancy without which no manly and resolute self-possession can exist, it wears off the edge of moral sensitiveness, when we see ourselves surrounded by men with loose political principles, by a society destitute of active public opinion, which neither cheers the honest nor frowns down immoral boldness; when we hear of bribed judges, perjured officers, suborned witnesses, of favor instead of law, and can perceive only listless spectators, without any opinion of their own, any spirit of veracity and trustworthiness or mutual dependence.”

This is exactly the theory applicable to Mexico. It is

idle to ascribe the chaotic state in that country to the hybrid race that dwell there.

Modern Biological Views.

Such great American authorities on biology as Professor Boas and Professor Loeb, of Columbia University, have frequently stated that intermarriage of Japanese and Americans begets offspring by no means inferior to either race. Professor Baelz, a German physician of the Tokio Imperial University, says on this matter:

“On this question I may speak with a certain degree of authority, having been the first, and in fact up to this day the only scientist, who has made a special study of the comparison of the physical qualities of the Japanese and European races. Besides, as a physician in Tokio during thirty years, I have had the opportunity of examining an unusually large number of Eurasians, and I have paid particular attention to them. The result of my observations is that they are a healthy set of people, and I do not hesitate to say that not one of the common arguments against them is supported by science. They are on an average well built, and show no tendency to organic disease more than Europeans or Japanese do. This is the more remarkable as many of them grow up under unfavorable circumstances, the father often having left them with little money to the care of a mother who has no authority over them. This is a particularly important point if the moral qualities are considered. In Europe, too, we know that abandoned illegitimate children very often turn out badly, and a fair comparison must take that into serious consideration. To make quite sure about the intellectual and moral qualities of the Eurasian, I have asked the opinion of the man who is more than any other qualified to give an authoritative judgment—Mr. Heinrich, director of the School of the Morning Star. He has had in his classes, side by side, Europeans, Japanese, and almost all the male half-breds in Tokio. His opinion is, that if properly brought up and well-looked after, the half-breds are morally and intellectually in no way inferior to the children of both races. As a rule they are taller and more robust than the Japanese, and in every branch of learning they are fully up to the standard of their fellow-scholars.”

Climate, diet, dwelling, social environment, and a hundred other things greatly affect human stature and physiognomy. In antiquity, the Fins were a branch of the Mongolian race,

yet there is hardly any semblance of similarity between the Fins of today and the Mongolians of today. Some of the races that dwell in Russia, Hungary, and Hobemia are also members of the Mongolian stock, but today they are more closely allied to the Caucasian race than to the Mongolian. Ethnologists agree that the Koreans are of the Aryan stock. The Ainus who dwell in northern Japan are also of Aryan origin. And yet owing to the environment in which they have lived for centuries they are today more of the Mongolian type than of the Caucasian. When we look beyond the horizon of the present and far into the ages that are to come we cannot but believe that the hands of Providence will gradually mold the white and semi-white races of the East and the West into one type, or at least eliminate many of the features that today distinguish the Occidental from the Oriental.

But how about the present? Our answer is simple. Infinite patience, coupled with firm determination, good nature backed with strong will, polite smile combined with stiff backbone, courtesy accompanied with self-respect and sound judgment—these will take care of the present as far as the Japanese are concerned.

Professor Veblen on the Japanese Race.

I have already said more than I started out to say, and I conclude with the following quotation from a recent essay entitled "The Opportunity of Japan" written by Professor Thorstein Veblen, of the University of Missouri:

"In the point of their racial make-up the Japanese are very much the same as the Occidental nations from whom they are now borrowing ways and means and into the midst of whom they are driving their way by help of these borrowed ways and means.

"It is, of course, not intended to claim that there subsists anything like an identity of race, as between the Japanese and the Christian nations, nor even a particularly near or intimate relationship; but the run of the well known facts is sufficiently convincing to the effect that the Japanese people readily fall into the same ways of thinking and reasoning, that they readily assimilate the same manner of theoretical constructions in science and technology, that the same scheme of conceptional values and logical sequence carries conviction in Japan as in the Occident. Their intellectual perspective is so nearly the same that the same facts, seen in the same connection, are convincing to the

same effect. It need by no means imply an inclusive psychological identity or duplication, but the facility and effect with which the Japanese are taking to Western habits of thought in matters of technology and scientific knowledge shows a sufficiently convincing equality or equivalence between them and their Western fellow-men in respect of their intellectual make-up.

“This intellectual or psychological equivalence will stand out in relief when the Japanese case is contrasted with what has befallen certain other peoples, racially alien to the bearers of the Western culture, such as the Negro, Polynesian, or East Indian. These others have been exposed to the Occidental technological system—the system of the machine industry—but they have been brought to no effectual comprehension of the logic and efficiency of the Western technological equipment, have not acquired or assimilated the drift and bias of the material science of the West, and have, even under hard compulsion, been unable to effect anything like a practicable working arrangement with the Occidental system of mechanical efficiency and economic control.

“And even as the Japanese show this facile apprehension of Occidental methods and values in the domain of material knowledge, so also is there apparently a close resemblance in point of emotional complexion, suggested, e. g., by the close similarity between the feudal system as it has prevailed in Japan, and, in its time, in Western Europe. Similar material circumstances, particularly in respect of the industrial arts, appear to have induced similar institutional results and a parallel range of ideals and ethical values, such as would presume a somewhat closely similar run of human nature in the two cases.

“This similarity in point of native traits, if so it can be called, is due not to an identity of race but rather to a parallelism in racial composition. Like the peoples of Christendom, and more particularly like that group of peoples that cluster about the North Sea, and that make up the center of diffusion of the Western culture, the Japanese are, racially, a hybrid population. The several racial elements that go to make up the hybrid mixture are, of course, not the same in the two cases under comparison, nor are they, perhaps, at all nearly related in point of racial derivation. But both of these two contrasted populations alike show that wide-ranging variability of individuals that is characteristic of hybrid peoples, both in the absence of uniformity

in respect of physical type and in their relatively great variety of intellectual and spiritual endowment, both in degree and in kind. This variability of these hybrid peoples becomes more obvious when they are contrasted with peoples of relatively unmixed stock, or even with the average run of mankind at large. Indeed, it may be set down as an earmark of hybridism. It is a factor of serious consequence for the cultural scheme of any such population, particularly for its stability; since such a wide-fluctuating variability of individuals within any given community will give, in effect, a large available flexibility of type, and so will afford a wide and facile susceptibility to new ideas and new grounds of action.

“Such being the character of the human raw material in and by which the Japanese situation is to be worked out, it should presumably follow that, just as the material and matter-of-fact elements of Western civilization are finding ready lodgment and fertile ground among them, so should these intrusive matter-of-fact conceptions presently, and with celerity, induce the working out of a corresponding fabric of matters of imputation—principles of conduct, articles of faith, social conventions, ethical values. The impersonal and materialistic bias of modern science and technology has among the Western peoples, already gone far to dissipate those putative values on which any feudal and autocratic regime must necessarily rest. And since the same impersonal and materialistic frame of mind proves, to all appearance, to be characteristic of the Japanese, they should also expect presently to experience its spiritual, and therefore its institutional consequences.”

EYE TO EYE.

By Benjamin Ide Wheeler,
President University of California.

Japan and the United States must get on together in neighborliness and co-operation. The fates of geography and commerce make them sharers of the Great Northern Ocean. Down through the coming centuries they must live more and more in touch with each other. They must share and be patient; seek to see each through the other's eyes, yield a little, abate each a little of the full measure of

theoretic right. They must with deliberate intent plan to get on together. They cannot afford to let things drift, else there will arise continual sources of misunderstanding. They inherit fundamentally different traditions. In them meet the two poles of the historic world-order. It is not primarily a matter of racial contrast; it is a contrast of social and economic standards. Glossing over the fact with thin veneers of smiles and nice words and formal assurances is sheer folly, and folly fraught with immeasurable peril to both parties and to all the world. What we need is frankness of speech and honesty of action. Diplomacy is good as an occasional sedative, but inadequate as a food. We must face the plain facts. We must see with open eyes and confess with calm and righteous judgment the difficulties under which we each labor in reaching a basis of common understanding. How to understand each other's situation and point of view,—that is the problem—a hard problem, but there is no other way, except the way of anger. And anger settles nothing. It effects nothing but joint injury.

Whatever our later misunderstandings it is most fortunate that our first introduction to each other was favorable and all the early days of our intercourse most satisfactory. America will not soon forget how trustfully Japan gave her her hand to be led in at the gates of Occidental civilization. Nor will Japan forget the sympathy and support she received from America in her days of greatest stress. America has always entertained a feeling of real admiration for the people of the Island Kingdom and has regarded their progress with something of a godfather's pride. Such a tradition and such a relationship constitute for either people a definite national asset, and cannot be lightly thrown by the board.

We appreciate the wisdom of Japan's consent to the practical exclusion of Japanese laborers through the device of withholding passports under what is known as the "gentlemen's agreement", and we recognize the honorableness with which Japan has carried out her part of the contract. This would seem to be a fair example of one nation's appreciating the difficulties inherent in the situation of the other, i. e., of seeing things as the other sees them. We ask for a continuation of that attitude of sympathy. The Japanese people surely understand that it is not on merely arbitrary grounds that we insist on the necessity of denying admission to their laborers. If for any reason the

“gentlemen’s agreement” should be abrogated, we should find it extremely difficult to agree upon a treaty which would accomplish the purpose. Japan is one of the Great Powers of the world, her people represent one of the highest types of the world’s civilization. They are not unnaturally jealous of their position and sensitive regarding any apparent infringement of their claim. They would not welcome American legislation discriminating against them and they certainly would not agree to a treaty which by their very acceptance of it would constitute or seem to constitute a documentary confession on their part of oddity, if not of inferiority. We know these things are facts, and these facts make up the chief difficulty of our position—a difficulty for which we have as yet found no solution, a difficulty regarding which we earnestly solicit the sympathy of the Japanese people. The main reason why none of the measures looking toward exclusion have been adopted by recent Congresses is to be found in the unwillingness of our Government to offer what might be interpreted as an affront to the Japanese people.

We are hoping, however, that with the passage of time the Japanese people may come to recognize that our exclusion policy is by no means directed against them as a people, nor against any people, but concerns a world-area wherein economic conditions through age-long training and compacting have come to be essentially different from those prevailing in the sparse-settled lands of the frontiersmen. There could be no more convincing proof of this than that British Columbia and Australia, constituent parts of an Empire with which Japan is allied, agree entirely with California, Oregon and Washington as to the absolute necessity of exclusion and have adopted more drastic measures thereto, than have the United States.

As regards California and other Pacific States, I beg one item of tolerance. These States are not made up of perverse, rude people, slaves of labor unions who have arbitrarily conceived a malicious pleasure in misrepresenting and opposing people from the other side of the sea. They are rather to be thought of as being the Americans who have had practical experience with the problems involved in the contact of East and West and have arrived at the most sensible view regarding these problems; and it will be safe and reasonable to estimate that other Americans, as fast as they come to a full understanding of the

situation, will take the same view.

So much for my prayer that the Japanese may regard with sympathetic eye our difficulties; now I have to admit that in one chief point the Japanese have good reason to ask a return of the favor. I can see that in spite of all good will the Japanese Government finds it increasingly difficult to explain to its people our apparent discrimination against them. It appears as if we ranked them among the secondary people. It is not our intention, but if we look at the matter from the eyes of the Japanese, I think we cannot fail to see how the national pride is affected and how we are inevitably convicted in their minds of unfairness. They are a strong, proud people, naturally conscious of their achievement, rightfully ambitious of full recognition as a civilized nation. We shall have to listen to their desire and give it full weight. It is no specific thing that they ask—but only equal treatment among the nations. In this connection there commends itself to our attention the proposal of Dr. Gulick (*The American Japanese Problem*), which admits from any land, Asiatic or European, a certain fixed percentage of those from the same land who are already naturalized American citizens. This proposal has the double merit of avoiding a sudden change in the proportions of immigrants from different countries and of treating all on a common basis. I am surprised to see how little attention has thus far been devoted to this remarkable suggestion. More will surely be heard of it in the days to come. In close conjunction therewith will be considered the problems of naturalization now forcing themselves to attention, but whatever we consider and whatever we do, we must go to our work with the plain understanding that in one way or other we must get on together. For we are neighbors.

From "America to Japan,"

G. P. Putnam's Sons.

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Especially written for the Japanese-American News.

By Ray Lyman Wilbur,

President Leland Stanford Junior University.

The broad and idealistic aspirations of the Japanese make them natural co-workers with the best sentiment of the United States in trying to bring about more wholesome international relationships between all nations. Difference in ancestry and race need be no bar to the creation of the friendliest feeling on both sides of the Pacific. The rapid progress of modern transportation facilities is bringing Japan and the United States nearer together each year. Both countries are bound to have some clashing of interests, some differences in ideals, some misunderstandings. Both must live and both must live honorably. Both certainly can by mutual understanding and agreement live amicably together. A greater knowledge of Japan on the part of America and a clearer perception on the part of Japan of the attitude of the American laborer towards his desired standard of living will help much to keep both ready and willing to be patient, considerate and forbearing. America has welcomed those immigrants that are readily assimilated into its life, has regretted the forced immigration of the African races, and now looks askance, particularly while almost gorged with its present raw material, at the possibility of additions from Asia. The modern rise of the Japanese made possible by the secure foundations of the past has been too rapid to be grasped by the outsider. Patience, time, mutual knowledge, frankness, the striving for high ideals, will gradually settle problems that will only be accentuated by haste, bitterness or displays of force.

OUR RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Especially written for the Japanese-American News.

By Arthur I. Pope,

Professor of Philosophy, University of California.

For more than fifty years America enjoyed from the Japanese people and government a degree of good will that has rarely been accorded to one nation by another. Next to their own country, the Japanese people honored and loved America, and they enthusiastically expressed this friendship on many occasions. On their side the American people in turn profoundly admired the rapid and easy mastery of Western civilization which the Japanese displayed, our government lost no opportunity to show its friendliness, our artists and cultivated people made almost a cult of Japanese art, and when Japan fought with Russia, the Americans as a people hailed each victory with enthusiasm, deploring each reverse, honoring every hero almost as if their very own.

These happy relations have been painfully and needlessly marred. In place of the unanimous friendliness and admiration on the part of the Japanese we find among them despite forbearance and determined hopefulness considerable subdued hostility, and an annoyed perplexity. In place of the concord of unqualified admiration and good will from America, we find in many quarters—thought frequently more noisy and conspicuous than representative—the same suspicion, plus a more active and determined hostility. This situation, although not nearly so fundamental and serious as it is often pictured, is none the less sufficiently deplorable to call for determined diagnosis and equally determined remedy. There is too little international good will in the world for any of it to be wasted. There should be continued searching of hearts until all the causes for this mutual annoyance and suspicion be discovered and removed and a noble national friendship completely restored.

In the discussion of this rather delicate matter there has been a generally praiseworthy demand for frankness. But frankness has generally been most popular when it is at the expense of the other fellow. Too often frankness is but a virtuous cloak assumed to enable one to say a lot of disagreeable things about a neighbor, which if undisguised would be forbidden by common politeness. But frankness like charity ought to begin at home, and I have accordingly

thought it worth while to call attention again to some of the well known but not yet universally acknowledged failings of the Americans in their dealings with the Japanese.

There was one unstable feature about the rather idyllic early friendship between America and Japan. It did not rest upon any clear or comprehensive knowledge of one another. That indispensable basis for a sound and permanent friendship was pretty much lacking. Enthusiasm and sentiment are too fragile and temporary to ensure permanent regard surviving every strain. Perhaps out of the present annoyance will issue a fuller knowledge that shall ultimately guarantee a maturer and more solid friendship.

The fact that the anti-Japanese agitation was inaugurated by a criminal in co-operation with a lunatic furthered by labor agitators and sustained by a yellow press ought in itself have been enough to damn it; but the few sparks of legitimate difficulty and annoyance fell into the tinder of ignorance; hence all the trouble. Accurate, impartial, well diffused knowledge would have rendered this entire propaganda abortive. For the American hostility to the Japanese, such as it is, is in the main traceable to ignorance and misinformation; not only ignorance of Japan itself, its wonderful history, its unsurpassable art, its charming and poetic people and the many things that they do better than we do, but very frequently to actual dense ignorance of the very things complained of. The whole story of the controversy shows how dangerous ignorance is, how upon the slightest provocation—such as for example legitimate competition—ignorance breeds prejudice, while prejudice in its turn fosters a stupid and hideous brood of falsehood and hatred.

Such a situation is always rendered the more alarming, because of the number of persons ready to profit by such misunderstandings, who through malice or hope of personal advantage or both seek to inflame the needless quarrel, some by crawling innuendo, some by deliberate fabrication, such as the recent newspaper yarns about the Japanese Bernhardt. There are still certain newspapers that industriously spread lies, and play upon fear; there are still unscrupulous or ignorant politicians that have not hesitated to make the most silly and insulting remarks. Would that these false prophets and faithless servants who have sown the seeds of hatred and misunderstanding alone might reap the whirlwind.

Let us take a few examples of dangerous trouble-breeding ignorance. The word was pretty generally passed about at the time of the Anti-Alien Land Legislation that, despite the "gentlemen's agreement," hordes of Japanese were still ferreting their way into the country. No shred of evidence has ever been cited in behalf of this assertion, chiefly for the simple reason that there isn't any, for, as everyone knows who has made any effort to inform himself, there has been a steady decrease of Japanese in California since 1908, the total reduction, according to the official figures, being 4408.

The preposterous charge that wicked Japanese men were flooding the primary schools of San Francisco and corrupting the morals of our children turned out to be ridiculous, not to say contemptible calumny; but the weird tale was and is still believed by many, and unjustly created much hard feeling.

That the Japanese are paupers, that they are dirty and shiftless, has been charged and believed in some quarters, although the truth is wholly to the contrary. The accusation of extreme sexual immorality was almost as ill-founded, and has been well refuted by Dr. Gulick, as well as Mr. Woehlke's reckless charges about the dishonest failures of the Japanese banks. That the Japanese were everywhere underbidding American laborers was sufficiently refuted in the Mackenzie report, yet the many union laborers in the building trades and shops who have never felt any competition from the Japanese seem violently possessed of devils whenever the subject is mentioned. Americans are not supposed to be gullible, but when, since the age of hobgoblins and witches, have so many supposedly intelligent people been taken in by a wild tale as have been by the stories of the thousands of Japanese reservists drilling at night in secret places. Yet this really comical story has been repeated with solemn face in halls of legislation and thousands of Americans have believed it. Surely this shows a determined eagerness to believe anything bad or alarming about the Japanese. Again ignorance bred suspicion and hostility.

More plausible but equally unfounded has been the general conviction that a race, particularly an Oriental race, is a mysterious unchanging entity, incapable of permanent and happy adjustment, utterly incapable of assimilation to

American ways and ideals. But Ethnology and Race Psychology long ago consigned this prejudice to limbo along with theory that any particular race has any innate superior capacity.

The charge that Japan has closed the door in Manchuria to American trade originated with some disgruntled American traders who had not the energy to make the adjustments necessary to succeed in that rather difficult market. But discrimination there is none, nor has there been any. But it seems that in some quarters a charge against the Japanese has only to be made to be believed and passed on with interest.

Could anything be more grotesque than an American complaint of the Japanese business morals? America, the home of graft, the country where municipal corruption has been brought to a fine art, where there is a lucrative profession devoted to instruct business how to evade the law, where state supreme courts have sold verdicts, where gigantic public utilities like the New Haven, Rock Island, St. Louis & San Francisco railroads were ruthlessly burglarized, where widows and orphans have been defrauded through notorious insurance scandals, where legislatures have been bought and sold and franchises stolen—can such a country with such a beam of unrighteousness in its own eye afford to look for a mote of dishonesty in any neighbor's eye? In truth our business morality has made us a hissing and a byword among the nations, and if humiliation does not suffice to stop the mouth of our complaint against others who in a retail way may exemplify our wholesale sins, at least our sense of humor ought to silence us. Indeed had they chosen to take it, the Japanese could have found ready to hand a fearful retort. Would we who have had to bear so much false witness against our neighbor have overlooked or refrained had we a similar opportunity?

Not to review the innumerable examples of misinformation and prejudice, such as the repeatedly exposed fake about the Chinese tellers in Japanese banks, how many Americans who have glibly condemned the recent Japanese negotiations with China have taken the trouble to accurately inform themselves concerning those demands and the history behind them. They are in fact surprisingly innocent when examined apart from headlines. How many have stopped to consider that a corrupt, inefficient, tyrant-ridden, rebellion-torn China is an extreme menace to the safety of Japan,

particularly in view of the quite unscrupulous and unjustified aggressions of European nations who have not hesitated to use China as a basis for trouble making. Only with a devoted, fortified and wisely guided China can there be a permanent peace in the Orient. We who made war on Spain because of the injustice and chronic disorder at our doors, we who proclaim the Monroe Doctrine and cry "America for the Americans," how could we do otherwise if we were fair-minded, than approve of the Japanese policy of "Asia for the Asiatics"? And yet even the display of force necessary to carry out the Japanese program was so repugnant to the majority of the Japanese people that the ministry was nearly overthrown.

Yet if there are many essential conditions of the problem which the average American is ignorant of, if his ignorance has been a receptive and productive soil for unfounded charges with their consequent train of suspicion and hostility, culminating as they did in an unjust, discriminatory, unnecessary land law—a law, by the way, quite at variance with the spirit of paramount treaty obligation—there are also some features of the question which the average Japanese may overlook. If it is a mystery how the average level-headed Americans could become so agitated over a mythical race issue, the Japanese should remember that we have not yet recovered from all the bitter waste and confusion of a dreadful conflict over a race issue. In the beginning there were only a few thousand negroes, yet from apparently innocent beginnings came forth a monstrous problem that well nigh wrecked the nation and even now sorely perplexes us. To the clear minded there is no analogy between the two situations, yet the memory of the first is still too agitating to permit of general clear thinking on the subject of a race issue.

There is one other source of uneasiness perhaps not so readily dispelled. It is reported here in America, how justly it is not easy to determine, that there is a strong and growing party in Japan who profess admiration for the militaristic philosophy that has of late been associated with the name of Germany. Whether this still numerically small group is relatively any more powerful than a similar group in this country is not clear. At any rate one thing is pretty certain. The average American hates militarism and all its works with utter loathing. While it is true that

America has in the last century, owing to very special conditions, largely increased her territory, none the less the Americans are not an aggressive people. They have no taste for conquest. They regard aggrandizement by force, opportunism, chauvinism, *real politik*, the will to power, and all the hateful paraphernalia of violence and scheming with abhorrence. Military power we as a people think of as a last resource, and the mere glorification of force for its own sake we regard as the pastime of fools and lunatics, or, at best, of narrow minded, dehumanized specialists. If there is a growing militaristic sentiment in Japan, and certain natural causes favor it, the knowledge of this sentiment is bound to make Americans uneasy. I do not now refer to the doctrine of defensive preparedness—though some of our vociferous and fanatical advocates of preparedness might reasonably cause concern in Japan—but rather to the approval of a certain set of unprincipled methods which are generally known as militarism. For this dragon there should be no quarter anywhere in the world.

Less justifiable, but equally real, is the fantastic dread among the less intelligent classes of Asia's millions of potential soldiers. That there is no motive for Asia to try to overrun and conquer the Western world, that there is nothing in the character or history of the Chinese or Hindus or Japanese to suggest that they would ever want to attempt such a thing, even if they could see any prospect of success; these are potent considerations quite lost to those who are agitated by mere numbers. Again it is ignorance that harbors this folly, and a really enlightened acquaintance with the Orient, and a more honorable and generous policy on the part of the European nations having business in the Orient, will suffice to lay this ghost forever. As Commissioner Harada well said at a recent dinner given to the Japanese Commissioners at the University of California, "The only Yellow Peril is the peril of Yellow Journalism."

If ignorance is the root evil of the whole issue, knowledge will be the radical cure, and an unremitting campaign of education for both nations, but more especially for America, will lay a basis for a sound and permanent friendship that can never be disturbed by innuendo or falsehood. Surprising as it may seem to many complacent Americans, America has a great deal to learn from and about Japan. In proportion as we do learn in just that proportion will the silly and mendacious stories about the Japanese cease

to have currency, and will cease to breed needless suspicion and hostility. In proportion as we know Japan will we respect and honor her. With mutual good will, born of mutual knowledge, every difficulty can be settled readily and prejudice dispersed. Profitable co-operation will take the place of jealousy and distrust, and an interchange of material and cultural goods be promoted which shall favorably affect the destinies of both nations.

THE JAPANESE QUESTION IN AMERICA.

Especially written for the Japanese-American News.

By Walter Macarthur.

(Mr. Macarthur was for several years editor of the Coast Seamen's Journal and is prominent in the labour movement in California. He is an influential member of the Democratic Party, and is at present a Shipping Commissioner for San Francisco.)

The movement for Asiatic exclusion is based chiefly upon economic grounds. There is, of course, a racial aspect of the question. This latter phase, in the judgment of many persons, has assumed proportions that overshadow the economic considerations involved. It is in this connection that we find the chief source of the agitation that has taken place, and which has tended to create bad feeling and misunderstanding, with the result of obscuring the real question at issue.

In discussing the racial characteristics of the Japanese people much has been said which, whether true or not, might better have been left unsaid, and which, in the nature of things, is not susceptible of proof. No one, I take it, will deny the fact that racial differences exist between the peoples of the Orient and the Occident. As to the extent of these differences, their character, and the effect of a possible admixture upon either people, there is much room for discussion, but very little prospect of arriving at any definite conclusion.

The very uncertainty of the problem gave opportunity for the exploitation of theories and the assertion of dogmas. This opportunity was taken full advantage of, no doubt honestly in most instances, and in others with more than a suspicion of interested motive, apart from the welfare of those immediately concerned.

In one instance, a certain newspaper, with a well-established reputation as an opponent of every movement for the promotion of the public interests, constituted itself the especial champion of Japanese exclusion. The friends of that movement naturally availed themselves of this powerful influence. Being unable, of course, to direct the policy of their new-found champion, they were unwittingly made a party to views and suggestions, and even to actions, which they did not approve, but for which they were naturally, and in a sense rightly held responsible.

In another instance, no less an authority than the then President of the United States assumed an attitude, with reference especially to the "school question", which had then reached an acute stage, that was calculated to create the deepest resentment among the people of the West, without regard to their views concerning the wisdom of the course adopted by the avowed exclusionists.

These are but examples of the state of things that existed during the critical period of the negotiations for a restriction of immigration from Japan. It may safely be said that whatever danger lay in these negotiations was due more to the bad temper created by misrepresentation and the false attitude of these powerful factors in the case than by anything directly related to the real issue in hand.

In short, the real issue was in danger of being entirely lost sight of, so that the outcome turned upon a question of national pride rather than upon the common-sense economic proposition really involved. This proposition would not of itself have led to any serious misunderstanding on either side.

I have always assumed, and still assume, that the Japanese people would, if given an opportunity to get the true point of view of the American people, agree with us that a restriction, or even exclusion, of Japanese laborers would be advantageous both to them and to us. It was the injection of the idea of racial inferiority—an idea that had no place in the minds of any honest exclusionist—that led to the misunderstanding and created a breach between the two peoples.

I believe that there are racial differences between the American and the Japanese peoples, and that these differences must be taken into consideration in this connection in order that the future welfare of the people of the United States may be safeguarded against any injurious admixture,

either in the family or in the political life of the country. I do not, however, assume any superiority on one hand or inferiority on the other.

I am perfectly willing to accept the theory that we have nothing to fear at the hands of an inferior people. If this theory be correct, it follows that our fears of Japanese immigration arise from an instinctive conception of superiority on the part of the latter. But, all theories aside, the fact remains that any influx of labor coming from any part of the world should be guarded against in view of the present state of the so-called labor market.

How to prevent an influx of labor is a question not of national dignity, of personal pride, of inferiority, or of superiority, but simply of common-sense practical legislation, based upon well understood rules of legal procedure.

We all agree, I believe, that any measure which shall regulate immigration in such manner as to conserve the right of the American people to the enjoyment of the resources of the country and to develop their national life in accordance with their own ideals and traditions, may not only be rightly sought by the American people, but should also be accepted by the peoples of all other countries as fundamental to the progress of the nation.

I am a firm believer in the virtue of face-to-face and shoulder-to-shoulder association. I think that in all cases much more may be achieved by such means than by mass meetings, pronunciamientos and ultimata. A few short and honest, but not ugly, words will go further in harmonizing the relations between honest and intelligent men than any amount of the other sort of thing.

CALIFORNIA AND THE JAPANESE.

Epecially written for the Japanese-American News.

By George Malcolm Stratton,
Professor of Psychology, University of California.

My regret is deep that I have had no opportunity to know the land of Japan; but I am glad that even here in America I have been able to know something of the spirit of that country. And this knowledge had its beginning in an early friendship. When a student at Yale it was my good fortune to become acquainted with Dr.

Rikizo Nakashima, now a distinguished member of the faculty of the Imperial University of Tokyo. And he told me much about his native land; but, better still, he himself was so keen of mind, so sensitive morally, and withal so modest and kind, that from that hour I never could feel aught but respect and admiring sympathy for what lay in the Japanese character at its best.

Thus begun, this kindly feeling has been strengthened by all that I since have learned, and latest of all by the impression gained at the Fair in San Francisco during the months that now are closing.

For we of California cannot but discern an especial grace in the act of the Japanese in participating so heartily in the Exposition, and in giving from their exhibit so generously to the University of California. Such acts show a spirit as admirable as it is rare in the intercourse of nations. The world needs that there shall pass across its governmental boundaries acts of so true gentility.

It is to be hoped most earnestly that my own State of California will in due time reveal a like quality of conduct. I cannot but feel that in restricting the privileges of the Japanese freely to acquire land, her act, under the circumstances, was entirely without justification. The Japanese government had already agreed—and, I think, with wisdom,—to control the amount and kind of its emigration to America. And Professor Millis, in his recent and able study entitled “The Japanese Problem in the United States,” finds no reason whatever to doubt the fidelity with which Japan has kept her agreement with our government. Indeed in her desire to observe this agreement beyond its mere letter, she has also controlled her emigration to Canada and Mexico, lest her people might thus indirectly enter our land. The result of this care is that fewer Japanese are entering than are leaving the United States.

Now this check was in operation before the passage of the California land-law, and consequently that law cannot with any justice be judged necessary to prevent the State from being “flooded” with Japanese. The needlessness of the act is already recognized by many Californians; and it is my earnest hope that their number will increase until the State government will finally retrace its unfortunate step. For California is in a false position, and one that needlessly irritates the Japanese both here and in their own country. There are other ways, as I shall point out,

in which the act of the California Legislature may possibly in time be made of no effect; but for the honor of the State, in which as a native I take an especial pride, I hope that she will of her own free choice repeal her unhappy legislation.

Our National Congress freely and without pressure from without annulled its own act regarding the tolls of the Panama Canal, because it seemed to many Americans to be of doubtful propriety in view of our treaty with England. And even so we must hope that in the end the Legislature of California will see a higher honor in the repeal of its own unjustified act. The time, the great war, is educating us all to a sense of international responsibility, to a greater readiness to give weight to the claims of those without. The times make us aware that each nation, and each portion of the nation, such as the State of California, must work with a will for the great ends of justice and order and the respect of nations beyond our own.

A repeal by California herself, as I have already said, would be most desired by those who are jealous of her honor. But if by some blindness the State should stand doggedly where she is, then there are at least two possibilities which may bring relief. The one is, the plan suggested by Dr. Gulick: For the limitation of immigration according to the number of persons foreign born already in our country; and for the admission to citizenship of all those personally fit for the privilege, without regard to race. By making it possible for the Japanese to acquire citizenship, this would meet the difficulty created by the California law. For this law restricts the privilege merely of those not eligible to citizenship; and should the Japanese once be made eligible, then by that very fact they would escape the prohibitions of the law.

Another mode of relief is being urged by ex-President Taft, who would have all matters affecting the rights of aliens within the various States of the Union taken from the control of the States and placed under the care of the National government. Such a change is greatly needed; for as matters are at present, the foreign relations of the entire country may be imperilled by some local legislation and local feeling. Questions that vitally affect the nation as a whole, as do those of the rights of aliens, should be decided by the nation, and not by a particular State.

In a situation such as this, with all its legal complications, the American friends of Japan appreciate the self-control which she has shown. Wise indeed are the recent words of Baron Shibusawa when, in speaking of this problem in California, he said: "In my judgment all that is needed there is mutual concession and a measure of patience on the part of both." The continued patience, the continued expectation that soon or late the sense of justice of the Americans will find expression,—this on the part of the Japanese seems to me in every way worthy of a high-minded nation. Japan's readiness to act with courtesy and good will even to the particular State that had been least careful of Japanese sensibilities, must gain for her a still larger friendship. She has been wise, too, in not pressing upon us, in season and out of season, her own view of her people's rights. She has trusted to the healing influence, the wisdom-giving influence, of time. The words she has occasionally uttered, as in that notable collection of papers by many of her distinguished men, called "Japan to America," will surely contribute to this healing. Those who have at heart the interest and dignity of the United States cannot but trust that America as a whole, and every part of America, will in all things prove worthy of the respect of her excellent and great neighbor across the sea.

THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN.

Epecially written for the Japanese-American News.

By James W. Mullen,

Editor "Labour Clarion," San Francisco.

It is the desire of the American labor movement that sincerely harmonious relations be maintained between the governments of the United States and Japan, just as it desires the friendship and co-operation of all other people in the work of lifting all humankind up to a broader, brighter and happier existence.

The labor movement is as broad as the earth and welcomes the opportunity to be of service to the workers of every clime without regard to race, color or creed. It is insistent that improved conditions, once established, shall never be torn down, and that the leveling process in adjusting inequalities between sections shall always be upward

to the altitude of the higher, and never downward to the lower. To this end it directs its energies.

The American workers have struggled through long years of bitter strife in building up the conditions that surround them in their daily life, and very naturally they propose to guard the conditions for which they have paid such a price with zealous care. Out of this feeling has grown the present problem that now clamors for solution.

The Japanese workers who came to our shores were willing to work longer hours and for less pay than were the toilers already here, and this had a tendency to break down trade union rules and lower the established standard of living. To this the American worker most strenuously objected and began to call for restriction of the immigration from Japan. The objection of the American worker to the Japanese was not based upon racial ground. It was economic. The racial question, of course, has since been injected into the issue by designing persons, and has caused much bad feeling between the two peoples, but labor's objection still remains an economic one.

It has been the experience of the organized workers of the world that the better men know each other the stronger grows the respect of each for the other, and it is the hope of the American toiler that in some such way may be found a solution for the problems that now cause friction and discord between the people of the North American continent and those of Japan.

The coming to this country of the two representatives of the Japanese workers, B. Suzuki and S. Yoshimatsu, as fraternal delegates to our conventions, and the exchanging of views and opinions between these men and representatives of American trade unions, has done much to clear the atmosphere and arrive at a better understanding as to the aims and desires of the peoples on both sides of the Pacific.

The American worker is constantly confronted with a problem of unemployment and is endeavoring to limit immigration, not only from Japan, but from all other countries as well, and this policy will doubtless be continued until such time as conditions have been established here that will provide the opportunity of earning a living to all the workers now here. This, the American worker feels, is a sane, sensible and thoroughly reasonable policy against which no worker can justly complain.

As the process of organization of the workers of Japan

advances, and improved conditions surrounding them are brought about, wages increased and the length of the work day shortened, there will be less desire on the part of these workers to emigrate to the United States, and with these conditions prevailing in Japan there would be less danger to the American workers' standards if they did come here, because they would then be imbued with trade union ideals and willing to stand up for them.

With the intelligent men of the two countries desirous of maintaining friendly and mutually helpful relations there can be but scant satisfaction in the situation for the jingoes and alarmists on either side of the Pacific, and with such men as Baron Shibusawa taking an active and unselfish interest in the problems of labor, both here in the United States and in his own country, it is more than likely some satisfactory adjustment of our difficulties will eventually be reached.

WHAT THE WEST MIGHT LEARN FROM JAPAN.

By George Kennan.

In a recent editorial on the improved relations between Russia and Japan, the Petrograd Reitch said: "It was easy for us to make friends with the Japanese, after the war of 1904-5, because they always fought us like gentlemen."

To the dispassionate observer of wars, nothing is more striking than the difference between the spiritual attitude of the Japanese toward the Russians, in the war of 1904-5, and that of the combatants toward one another in the present conflict. If ever a nation was engaged in a life-and-death struggle for existence, Japan certainly was so engaged ten years ago; and yet, the magnitude of the issue involved never inspired a "Hymn of Hatred" in Japan, nor excited rancorous animosity in the hearts of the Japanese people. They fought the Russians as fiercely as either side has fought the other in Belgium or France; but they never hated their enemies, either nationally or personally, and never failed to do full justice to Russian motives and conduct. In the course of two years' intercourse with Japanese soldiers and the Japanese people, between 1904 and 1906, I never heard a mean, ungenerous, or bitter remark made about the Russians, their character or their conduct of the war.

Soon after I arrived at Port Arthur, in the fall of 1904, I noticed that the Japanese Red Cross hospitals, in the zone of fire, were not flying the Red Cross flag; and when I inquired the reason for this, a Japanese officer told me, quietly and without emotion, that the Red Cross flags seemed to attract the fire of the Russian artillery, and they had therefore hauled them down. He made no comment, and one might have supposed that he regarded the firing on a Red Cross hospital as a natural and normal incident of war.

About the same time, I myself saw what seemed to be the deliberate and purposeful shelling of a long train of stretcherbearers, who were carrying Japanese wounded back from the front; but no Japanese, in conversation with me, ever referred to this cruel and dishonorable act as an illustration of Russian barbarity. They simply ignored it.

A few weeks later, I was called upon to act as interpreter in an interview between two Japanese staff officers and three or four Russian prisoners who had just been brought back from the firing line. I feared that the officers might put me in an unpleasant and awkward position by requesting me to ask the Russians questions which, as loyal soldiers, they could not properly answer; but I need have had no such fear. Not a single attempt was made to learn the state of affairs in Port Arthur, and not a question was asked that a loyal Russian soldier might not frankly answer without betraying his comrades, or the interests of his country. The Japanese would doubtless have been glad to know what the real state of affairs in the besieged fortress was; but to obtain the desired information by forcing or tempting a Russian prisoner to disregard his military oath and betray his comrades would have been a violation of the Japanese code of honor.

Evidence of Japanese chivalry and courtesy toward their enemies in Manchuria are so numerous that I hardly know how to make a selection from them; but every one who paid any attention to that war must remember the Japanese memorial service in honor of the Russian sailors who sank in the cruiser "Variag" at Chemulpo; the monument erected to the Russian soldiers who perished at Port Arthur; the memorial crosses put up over the graves of Russians who died between Liao-yang and Mukden; and the letter from the officers of the Japanese army to the officers of the Russian army, congratulating them on having

had in their service so heroic a man and so devoted a soldier as the spy Vassilli Liuboff. The Japanese shot the spy, but they paid honor to his brave Russian spirit, and expressed the courteous hope that in the Russian ranks might be found many soldiers equally patriotic and loyal. Does that sound like anything that we have heard from either side in the present conflict?

What, then, may the nations of the West, in the turmoil of war, learn from the greatest nation of the Orient? First of all, it seems to me, they may learn to hold their tongues and use their brains; to kill their enemies without insulting them; and to hit hard but fight fairly.

AMERICA AND JAPAN—WAR OR PEACE.

By Jefferson Jones.

(Mr. Jefferson Jones is on the editorial staff of the Minneapolis Journal, his father being the proprietor of that paper. Mr. Jones spent some two years in Japan and was connected with the Japan Advertiser, an American newspaper in Tokio. During the siege of Tsing-tau, the German stronghold in China, he was with the Japanese army and enjoyed the privilege of observing the Japanese military operations at close range. The following article is taken from his book entitled "The Fall of Tsing-tau," just published by Houghton Mifflin Company.)

We have seen placed on the statute books of Canada and Australia legislation which, as a barrier to the Japanese, is far more stringent than any acts passed by our Pacific Coast States. But has the reader heard any dangerous controversy arising between Japanese and British diplomats over the subject, or has there been any talk of Great Britain and Japan going to war because of such legislation?

No; because Great Britain has recognized Japan by its Anglo-Japanese Alliance. It is recognition from the Powers that Japan primarily wants—not emigration. The Japanese Government knows that the "all in all" question of its future is not bound up in the emigration of its citizens to the United States, there to take up their life residence, to rear their families and to become American citizens. But it does know that in the heterogeneous condition of the Far East it must solidify its colonies if it does not intend to see

them rise in revolt and break away from the present Government. Emigration to America, Canada, or Australia will not bring about this desired condition for the Japanese Government, but emigration into her own colonies will.

Until twenty years ago the Japanese Empire consisted of one people and peace reigned supreme. Since then the Empire has acquired Formosa, Manchuria, the Liao-tung Peninsula, and Korea, and with the additional territory has come much turmoil in the colonial possessions from the contact of the Japanese with the natives. It has been a difficult question for the Japanese Government to solve, how best to link its added territory to the main empire; and the only practical solution of the matter has been emigration, sending its citizens from the main islands into Formosa and Korea, there to establish themselves in business and intermarry with the natives. In this way the foreigners would amalgamate in time with the Japanese.

But when it came to the emigration of its citizens, there was always the United States offering more opportunity than the Japanese Government could offer, and the natural trend was toward America.

Since the first outbreak of the California question, the Japanese Government has realized its mistake, and is now bending all efforts to make its possessions in China and about the Yellow Sea attractive enough to draw citizens of Japan into Japanese possessions rather than to America.

At present the Government has been meeting with much opposition in its immigration plans, for the Koreans as well as the natives of Formosa have a bitter hatred for the Japanese and trouble is met with once the peoples intermingle. With China still much of an enigma, and with its dissolution as a nation seemingly close at hand, much depends upon Japan's ability to solve her emigration question if she wishes successfully to accomplish her continental expansion in Asia and in the Pacific.

But during the present century, while Japanese emigration has been going on, and the Japanese war scare has been making the rounds of America, Japan has advanced, from being regarded by Europe as on the same level with China, to being a first-class Power, allied with Great Britain, and consulted by all nations in matters affecting the Far East.

To the Japanese the California land law appears to be a refusal to recognize them as a first-class nation, because our Government has provided nothing to offset that opinion.

Great Britain, however, while she, too, has been enacting California legislation in her colonies against the Japanese, has shown that she harbors nothing against them as a nation by signing the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.

Every foreigner who resides in Japan soon comes to learn that the Japanese are supersensitive. Failure to show little courtesies, which the foreigner would pass by with hardly a notice; strikes deep into the heart of the Oriental.

And so it is with America's Japanese problem. We have struck deep into the heart of the Japanese by seemingly refusing to recognize them. They will remember the action, which to them appears as an insult, until America—not Japan—does something to wash out the ill-feeling naturally resulting.

"I come now to the last important point demanding attention," writes Count Okuma, aged Japanese statesman, in his recent book, "Fifty Years of New Japan." "I mean our aspiration to be recognized by the world as a great nation. There is nothing strange in the demand that our people should be accorded the treatment due to their greatness as a Power, not merely in the Orient, but in the whole world."

With reference to the California question he says: "I am well aware that behind this anti-Japanese sentiment there exist various circumstances which deserve consideration. However, in so far as our people are disliked because they are Asiatics, there is nothing reasonable or logical in their hostile feeling. To reason against and to remove these prejudices and misconceptions is a mutual duty devolving as much on our people as on the Western nations concerned."

It is probably true that there are many Americans who dislike the Japanese because they are Asiatics, but these are in the minority; their bark carries with it no bite. On the other hand, the broad-minded men of both Japan and the United States realize that, underlying the California legislation against the Japanese, there are conditions which are proper for California to take note of. The work has been poorly done.

The average American and Japanese public have a misconception of the California legislation. It has a larger significance than just the question of admitting the Japanese. If the United States should admit the Japanese to immigration to this country, what point could you bring out in the Japanese as possible citizens that you could not find in

the Chinese or in the Hindu?

In fact, the California action is not aimed directly at the Japanese, though the latter may believe the opposite and feel the sting of it more sharply because their name is carried in the acts of legislation. No, the action is an indirect barrier to the immigration of any Asiatics to America. True, it is, there is already a federal regulation against the immigration of the Chinese into this country, but it is mainly because of economic reasons, as it is also the bar against the Japanese. Nevertheless, a great friendship exists between the United States and China, the same as there should exist between Japan and this country, and will exist as soon as America recognizes Japan satisfactorily as a Power.

Since Japan's stimulation of emigration to her own colonies of late, the Japanese war scare in America has been gradually subsiding, but jingo press artists from time to time continue to heap coal on the dying fire by spreading broadcast the untruthful report that the Japanese are landing troops on the shores of Turtle Bay in Southern California or in some other section of the Americas.

In speaking of the improved situation existing between the United States and Japan, Count Okuma said in April, this year :

"Practically all the friction that has arisen in America has grown out of one phase or another of the immigration question. That situation is improving somewhat and is one that I hope time will solve satisfactorily to both countries. It is a question which from its nature requires time for solution.

"The United States has had other such questions with other nations, which have always been solved by time, and so I hope for a similar solution of this question. There are now about eighty thousand Japanese in the United States—that is, in the mainland territory—and as many, or perhaps a few more, in Hawaii.

"This is a smaller number than were in the United States at the time the so-called gentlemen's agreement was concluded. Since that time more Japanese have come home from the United States than have gone there and the number in your country has been steadily reduced.

"This reduction has been slow, it is true, owing to the fact that a good many Japanese in America get married and the birth of children tends to keep up the total number

of Japanese there. But the influx of Japanese has been practically stopped and there is a gradual but steady reduction going on."

There is no real ground for apprehension, no real cause for alarm in the relations existing between the United States and Japan. I do not believe that Japan has, or ever had, any desire of warring with the United States. For economic reasons alone this appears to be true. Japan has not as yet recovered from her Russian war. Not one cent of the debt incurred in waging that conflict has yet been paid, and since that time the war operations at Kiao-chau have indebted the Government still further. Further acquisition of territory necessitating large expenditures to the Government in its upkeep, both in Manchuria and Korea as well as in Kiao-chau, have stripped the Japanese treasury.

During that period the United States has been Japan's best customer. We have purchased raw silk and tea to the extent annually of more than sixty million dollars, and in so doing have kept thousands of people in Japan in employment in this trade. If war was to be declared between the two countries, this trade would come to a standstill, the Government would lose this income. Great Britain could not be used as the market for the once American tea-trade, for England has cultivated a taste for the better class of teas, either Indian or Chinese. Nor would England take up the importation of Japanese raw silk dropped by America, because they have found the Chinese silk more stable.

But the real question existing between Japan and the United States, is the attitude of the two Governments towards China. On this point rests the only true apprehension for fear of a war. Count Okuma, and other Japanese statesmen, know that in the California immigration question there are good points to be stated for both sides, and they realize that time alone can settle the matter in the peaceful way they are desirous that it shall be settled. In the question of China, however, the situation is more serious.

THE JAPANESE QUESTION IN AMERICA.

Especially written for the Japanese-American News.

By Carlos K. McClatchy,
of The Sacramento Bee.

Unless improper issues and controversies are injected into the relations between the two countries, the United States and Japan should be partners and friends in a common development, the United States as a leader on this continent and Japan as the foremost power of the Orient.

On that ground, the relations between the two nations undoubtedly will be friendly and close. Americans admire Japan for her initiative and ability, unreservedly grant her a leadership in the affairs of the Orient, and cheerfully invite her co-operation in a joint commercial, intellectual and humanitarian progress of the Western World as distinguished from the European continent.

In that sphere, Americans have nothing but friendliness for the Japanese.

California was extremely partisan in favor of Japan during the Japanese-Russian war. At that time, all sympathy was with the nation of the Orient. There is as much latent friendship and common aims in the breasts of Americans today, only awaiting the removal of certain irritating differences to spring into a full blossom of common understanding and joint benefits.

But upon that difference, to grant to Japanese unrestricted immigration and citizenship, there can be no compromise, if I judge the temper and convictions of Americans rightly.

The United States never should give Japanese free immigration and citizenship, nor should Japan ask it. The extension of those privileges perhaps, for the moment, might establish a closer international friendship, but would be a certain breeder of trouble for the future.

In the past two or three years, California opinion of the Japanese has changed greatly. Where the first influx of Japanese in large numbers, with the consequent Orientalization of large areas of fruitful farms, engendered hostility toward all Japanese, closer acquaintance has led to the distinction between the Japanese as an individual and the Japanese in hordes.

The last two years, and especially the Exposition, has brought a wider appreciation of the Japanese individual as a scholarly, aggressive man of action and ambition. For that type, the student, the professional man, the scientist, the traveler, America extends a hearty welcome.

But against the admission of large numbers of Japanese, to become residents and citizens of this country, the American people should firmly stand. No comparison of the respective merits of the two races is intended. The plain fact that there are too many differences of various kinds means that throwing open the doors would insure a continual conflict and contest between the two races, which Californians especially are determined shall not arise.

Nor need there be any necessity for it. There is the whole Orient for Japanese extension and supremacy. The United States should have this continent unhindered.

For the Japanese individual there is the heartiest welcome to these shores. But there will be no reception for Japanese in large numbers for the colonization of California.

Americans ask no more in Japan, nor does the Empire grant more than the United States already gives. In fact, Japanese have many more privileges in this country than Americans in Japan.

Friendship and common action in working out joint progress is desired.

But neither country should intrude itself upon the domestic concerns of another by insisting that its citizens be welcomed in large numbers to precipitate the conflict of two essentially different races that is bound to breed nothing but trouble.

TREATY OBLIGATIONS.

By Hon. Elihu Root,

Ex-Secretary of State, ex-United States Senator.

These extracts are from an address on the treaty obligations of the United States with Japan (cited with the permission of the author) given at Washington before the American Society of International Law, on the 19th of April, 1907.

It is impossible that the human mind should be addressed to questions better worth its noblest efforts, offering a greater opportunity for usefulness in the exercise of its powers, or more full historical and contemporary interest, than in the field of international rights and duties. The change in the theory and practice of government, which has marked the century since the establishment of the American Union, has shifted the determination of great questions of domestic national policy from a few rulers in each country to the great body of the people, who render the ultimate decision under all modern constitutional governments. Coincident with that change the practice of diplomacy has ceased to be a mystery confined to a few learned men who strive to give effect to the wishes of personal rulers, and has become a representative function answering to the opinions and the will of the multitude of citizens, who themselves create the relations between the states and determine the issues of friendship and estrangement, of peace and war. Under the new system there are many dangers from which the old system was free. The rules and customs which the experience of centuries had shown to be essential to the maintenance of peace and good understanding between nations have little weight with the new popular masters of diplomacy; the precedents and agreements of opinion which have carried so great a part of the rights and duties of nations toward each other beyond the pale of discussion are but little understood. The education of public opinion, which should lead the sovereign people in each country to understand the definite limitations upon national rights and the full scope and responsibility of national duties, has only just begun. Information, understanding, leadership of opinion in these matters,

so vital to wise judgment and right action in international affairs, are much needed.

It is a pleasure to be able to say that never for a moment was there, as between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan, the slightest departure from perfect good temper, mutual confidence, and kindly consideration; and that no sooner had the views and purposes of the Governments of the United States, the State of California, and the city of San Francisco been explained by each to the other than entire harmony and good understanding resulted, with a common desire to exercise the powers vested in each, for the common good of the whole country, of the state, and of the city.

In the distribution of powers under our composite system of government the people of San Francisco had three sets of interests committed to three different sets of officers—their special interest as citizens of the principal city and commercial port of the Pacific Coast represented by the city government of San Francisco; their interest in common with all the people of the State of California represented by the Governor and Legislature at Sacramento; and their interests in common with all the people of the United States represented by the National Government at Washington. Each one of these three different governmental agencies had authority to do certain things relating to the treatment of Japanese residents in San Francisco. These three interests could not be really in conflict; for the best interest of the whole country is always the true interests of every state and city, and the protection of the interests of every locality in the country is always the true interest of the nation. There was, however, a supposed or apparent clashing of interests, and, to do away with this, conference, communication, comparison of views, explanation of policy and purpose were necessary. Many thoughtless and some mischievous persons have spoken and written regarding these conferences and communications as if they were the parleying and compromise of enemies. On the contrary, they were an example of the way in which the public business ought always to be conducted; so that the different public officers respectively charged with the performance of duties affecting the same subject-matter may work together in furtherance of the same policy and with a common purpose for the good of the whole country and every part of the country. Such a concert of action with such a purpose was established by the

conferences and communications between the national authorities and the authorities of California and San Francisco which followed the passage of the Board of Education resolution.

There was one great and serious question underlying the whole subject which made all questions of construction and of scope and of effect of the treaty itself—all questions as to whether the claims of Japan were well founded or not; all questions as to whether the resolution of the school board was valid or not—seem temporary and comparatively unimportant. It was not a question of war with Japan. All the foolish talk about war was purely sensational and imaginative. There was never even friction between the two Governments. The question was, What state of feeling would be created between the great body of the people of the United States and the great body of the people of Japan as a result of the treatment given to the Japanese in this country?

What was to be the effect upon that proud sensitive, highly civilized people across the Pacific of the discourtesy, insult, imputations of inferiority and abuse aimed at them in the columns of American newspapers and from the platforms of American public meetings? What would be the effect upon our own people of the responses that natural resentment for such treatment would elicit from the Japanese?

The first article of the first treaty Japan ever made with a Western power provided:

“There shall be a perfect, permanent, and universal peace and a sincere and cordial amity between the United States of America on the one part, and the empire of Japan on the other part, and between their people respectively, without exception of persons or places.”

Under that treaty which bore the signature of Matthew Calbraith Perry, we introduced Japan to the world of Western civilization. We had always been proud of her wonderful development—proud of the genius of the race that in a single generation adapted an ancient feudal system of the Far East to the most advanced standards of modern Europe and America. The friendship between the two nations had been peculiar and close. Was the declaration of that treaty to be set aside? At Kurihama, in Japan, stands a monument to Commodore Perry, raised by the Japanese in grateful appreciation, upon the site where he

landed and opened negotiations for the treaty. Was that monument henceforth to represent dislike and resentment? Were the two peoples to face each other across the Pacific in future years with angry and resentful feelings? All this was inevitable if the process which seemed to have begun was to continue, and the Government of the United States looked with the greatest solicitude upon the possibility that the process might continue.

It is hard for democracy to learn the responsibilities of its power; but the people now, not governments, make friendship or dislike, sympathy or discord, peace or war, between nations. In this modern day, through the columns of the myriad press and messages flashing over countless wires, multitude calls to multitude across boundaries and oceans in courtesy or insult, in amity or in defiance. Foreign officers and ambassadors and ministers no longer keep or break the peace, but the conduct of each people toward every other. The people who permit themselves to treat the people are surely sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind, for a world of sullen and revengful hatred can never be a world of peace. Against such a feeling treaties are waste paper and diplomacy the empty routine of ideal form. The great question which overshadowed all discussion of the treaty of 1894 was the question: Are the people of the United States about to break friendship with the people of Japan? That question, I believe, has been happily answered in the negative.

LEST WE FORGET.

By John Foord,

It may sound rhetorical, but it may also turn out to be true that "when history shall have placed all the great political events of the nineteenth century in their proper perspective, none will bulk larger in the eyes of posterity than the appearance of Commodore Perry's fleet in Japanese waters". The obvious reason is that this event began a complete revolution in the relation between the West and the East by awakening to a consciousness of its power an Eastern nation which, for the first time in history, has shown itself able to assimilate in great measure the civilization of the West without surrendering its own, and thus to assert a claim to take rank on a footing of equality with the Great

Powers of the West in the arts both of peace and war. When, therefore, the Island Empire, whose seclusion for three centuries was broken in upon by the bearer of a letter from the President of the United States, became the defender of the principles and policy which this Government had deliberately adopted and steadfastly maintained in its efforts to conserve the commercial interests of its citizens in Eastern Asia, it was inevitable that the sympathy of the American people should be on its side. The fact was freely recognized that Japan had gone further than this country was prepared to go in submitting her case against Russia to the arbitrament of the sword. This she would hardly have done but for the lessons she had learned after the war with China in 1894—a war whose fruits she was not allowed to reap, although they were gathered in by Russia almost without an effort. It had become an accepted axiom of Japanese statesmanship that Korea was a dagger aimed at the heart of Japan, and it was sufficiently evident that no nation could regard with equanimity the prospect of an easily fortified peninsula, lying almost within stone throw of her shores, being absorbed by an aggressive military power.

Hence, in 1904, the world was called upon to contemplate one of the most remarkable situations in all history. The battle of human freedom which was won against the hosts of Persia at Marathon and Salamis was then being waged by a people of unmixed Asiatic blood against an Empire calling itself European, and claiming to be the champion of white men against the yellow races. This is surely a fact to be remembered by people who are frightened by the bogey of a regenerated Asia, equipped with the weapons of modern warfare but filled with the lust of conquest. We owe it to Japan that we have not today another Europe facing us, on the other side of the Pacific, garrisoned by hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops bearing modern arms and trained by European soldiers. With the defeat of Japan the dominion of Russia would have unquestionably been extended to the Yellow River, that of Germany would have been enlarged to meet the Yangtze, that of France prolonged from Indo-China into Szechuan, leaving that of Great Britain to occupy the unclaimed space between. There could have been no stable balance of power between such forces, dividing among them, in the shape of spheres of influence and of sovereignty, a dismembered China. The

inevitable conflict for supremacy, sooner or later, would have ensued—a conflict envenomed, sanguinary, and destructive beyond all precedent—with only this certain issue, that the victor would dominate Asia, and that with this dominance would come the reduction of the United States to the rank of a secondary Power on the Pacific. From a standing menace, equally to the peace of the world and the future of the United States, Japan saved us in 1904. Have we so soon forgotten the magnificent prowess and the scrupulous honor of the country which performed that feat, as to listen with patience to brainless twaddle about the “yellow peril”, and reckless aspersions on the good faith of Nippon?—*From “America to Japan,” G. P. Putnam’s Sons.*

THE PACIFIC COAST PERIL.

By Francis Butler Loomis,
Former Assistant Secretary of State.

The campaign against the Japanese in California as it is carried on by professional agitators seems to be based upon misinformation and misunderstanding, some of which is real and some of which is wilfully feigned.

There can be no clear comprehension of the questions at issue between the Government of Japan and that of our own country unless certain fundamental facts with respect to Japan become a matter of common knowledge.

1. The Government of Japan earnestly desires peace with the United States and a continuance of the pleasant relations which have marked the intercourse between the two countries for upwards of fifty years.

2. The Japanese people have an historic and sentimental bias in favor of the United States.

3. Japan is not seeking to acquire the Philippines, and there is no reason to think that she wants them.

4. Japan does not want war. She earnestly desires peace with all notions.

5. Great changes have taken place in Japan within the last decade. The pronounced manifestations of radical thinking and unrest which have been visible in all parts of the civilized world have had their sympathetic responses in Japan. Opposition to the Government and to the established order is stronger and more militant today in Japan than it ever

was before and this condition has to be taken seriously into account. In short, the making of war or peace in the future, in Japan, may not lie wholly in the hands of the Government .

In 1908 I had several talks with Prince Katsura and with Prince Ito. The day before leaving Japan, where I had discharged a confidential diplomatic mission, Prince Katsura, who was then Prime Minister, sent for me. He discussed for two hours the future of Japan and the plans which were then forming for the development of that country in an industrial way. It was expected that what he told me would be informally communicated to the Government of the United States. Early in the following year, a fortnight before Mr. Taft was inaugurated, there was a recrudescence of the Japanese question in this country, and I put in the form of an interview the salient points of my talk with Prince Katsura. This was published at the instance of the President and of Mr. Knox, who was about to become Secretary of State. The article was given wide publicity by the Associated Press and had a tranquilizing effect, for Prince Katsura made it very plain that Japan had no further military ambitions, no desire for conquest, no design upon the Philippines. He said with sincere and convincing emphasis that the future of Japan must be an industrial one.

“We must make this island,” he affirmed, “the great workshop and factory for the Orient, and try in a large measure to supply Oriental countries with manufactured goods. In the development of Korea, Formosa, and possibly some parts of Manchuria, we shall have all we want to do in the way of colonization and expansion. If we can well and wisely administer Korea and Formosa they will afford an outlet for practically all the Japanese who may wish to leave their native country. To bring about the upbuilding of Japan in an industrial sense and to develop Korea and Formosa will take all of our resources. We shall have neither time nor money for war. A certain military standard will have to be maintained for self-defense, but you will see that our expenditures in this direction will be reasonable and furnish no just cause for alarm or suspicion.”

The policy outlined by Prince Katsura and approved by Prince Ito has since been substantially followed.

This country in its official intercourse with Japan has never had reason to doubt the good faith, the honesty, the

straightforwardness of that Government. This is an important point and should be borne in mind by all persons who are interested in the Japanese and their relations to the United States. There is no Government on earth more scrupulous in its dealings with this country than that of Japan. We have nothing to fear from Japan so far as its Government is concerned. If questions of an embarrassing nature arise between the two countries, they are of our own making. If there is an unfortunate situation on the Pacific Coast in respect to the Japanese, we are responsible for it, not the Japanese Government. With unwavering constancy and fidelity they have maintained "the gentlemen's agreement" by which they undertook to suppress the immigration of Japanese laborers to the United States. The inflowing stream of coolies from Japan has ceased. There are about 60,000 Japanese in California, and the number remains practically stationary. The Japanese who are domiciled in our Pacific Coast states are not today a menace to those commonwealths in an economic, a political, or a moral way. Last year I traveled from one end of California to the other and visited every Japanese settlement of consequence. There I found that the Japanese agriculturists were peaceful, law-abiding, industrious people, generally very poor, and, like thousands of other new-comers to this country, living with rigid economy. One may find Portuguese, Greeks, and Armenians in California living just as poorly. The Japanese laborers prosper because they work hard and spend little. Many of them do not speak English and are ignorant of our customs, manners, and laws.

Americans, especially thriftless ones, do not like Japanese for neighbors, and among those who have come to our country there are, of course, some who are dishonest, some who violate contracts, some who do not keep their word. These shortcomings are not peculiar to the Japanese, however, for I can say, from personal experience in California, that I have discovered similar weaknesses on the part of rather prosperous immigrants from the south of Europe.

On the Pacific Coast there has been an active propaganda of hate carried on against the Japanese. It is easy to play on the strings of national feeling and prejudice. Hundreds of good citizens of California believe, because they have heard the statement made over and over again, that the Japanese are growing to be a dangerous element in the population,

and that American institutions, liberties, morals, and business are gravely menaced by their presence.

Among my personal acquaintances I find some who do not like the Japanese, and others, the majority, who are very friendly toward them. The line of division between these two opposing opinions in California is plain; on one side, are those who do not know the Japanese thoroughly well; on the other side, those who know and understand them, and who, moreover, know something about Japan and the Japanese Government. People who think well of the Japanese are, as a rule, those who know them well.

The Japanese in California ask only to be let alone. The more fortunate men of the Japanese race, the more prosperous and enlightened, have raised a considerable sum of money and are conducting in an intelligent fashion an educational campaign the purpose of which is to instruct the ignorant Japanese workingman in American ideas, manners, and ways of living, so that misunderstandings, the most frequent cause of conflict between races, may be removed. The educated Japanese in California, and there are many of them, are making great and constant efforts to improve the less fortunate of their fellow countrymen and to convert them into thoroughly desirable residents. The Japanese have done a great work in this direction. Indeed, they have done more than their share in the effort to live comfortably and pleasantly with the other people of California. If the Japanese were let alone, or were given the ballot and citizenship, the whole question would disappear. If the Japanese had the right to vote in California there would no longer be a Japanese question, as it is now understood. The politicians would not only cease to harry them, but would indeed strive to curry favor with them.

We are dealing with the Japanese as they are today. There is no question of unrestricted or unlimited immigration, consequently no present danger of an Oriental invasion.

After a careful personal survey of the situation I think one is justified in contending that decency and fair dealing and regard for justice and international good faith require that we should give the Japanese in this country the same treatment we give to other immigrants and the same treatment we expect the Japanese Government to accord our citizens who may wish to settle in Japan. Irritating and humiliating discriminations toward the Japanese should

cease. Let us deal honestly with the question. The Japanese are not going to overturn California, nor are they going to get an undue share of business. To the fruits of their industry, patience, self-denial, and frugality they are entitled.

Let us ask our Western friends to admit all this in reference to the Japanese and at the same time try to understand and value their good qualities instead of forever complaining about their bad ones, which are not, by the way, exclusively Japanese at all. In the matter of immorality, commercial dishonesty, and general bad conduct our own countrymen should not be the first to cast a stone. The assailants of the Japanese in this country talk as if these people from the Orient were the sole possessors of all the unworthy tendencies, instincts, and habits in the United States. As a matter of fact they are no better or worse than people of the same class in most other countries.

The Japanese question on the Pacific Coast has settled itself if the immigration remains strictly limited as it now is, and if our own people will give no further attention to it unless they have some urgent and important reason for so doing. The Japanese are few in number. They attend to their own affairs and want to be let alone. If they are let alone for a few years, it will be forgotten that they were ever considered a problem. If they are to be threatened and made victims of political parties and have to face continually the fear of unfair and humiliating legislation, then difficulties may arise which will not be merely local in character. A state of feeling may be engendered in Japan which the Government of that country cannot cope with, and which may develop into a situation of grave menace for this whole nation.

The peril of the situation on the Pacific Coast lies not in the fact that there are some thousands of well disposed Japanese trying to live there lawfully and in peace, but in the disposition of selfishly interested persons of other races to incite racial and economic prejudice against the Japanese.—*From "America to Japan," G. P. Putnam's Sons.*

THE JAPANESE QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Epecially written for the Japanese-American News.

By Wm. T. Bonsor,
Secretary Anti-Jap Laundry League
of San Francisco.

This is a problem which at the present time affects primarily the Pacific Coast and the Hawaiian Islands as the Japanese population in the United States is practically confined to these localities. The issues involved are therefore misunderstood by many as they are necessarily unfamiliar with the resultant conditions of Japanese immigration and competition.

The relations between the two countries are friendly and will continue friendly even though the Americans affected by Japanese aggression may strive and eventually win their objective—which in time to come will be favorably appreciated by all concerned as to the best interests of both the Japanese and American people.

Much can be said on this question. Men have written volumes. A brief statement can only touch upon it. It is said by some that the "Gentlemen's Agreement" will solve the question. If we take into consideration the Japanese immigration now permissible, including exempt classes, "Picture Brides," etc., added to a consideration of the large percentage of Japanese births in this country, it can be easily seen that the future Japanese population of the above mentioned localities will run into enormous figures. In other words, statistical facts and figures prove that California's future is seriously threatened by a similar condition as is now existing in the Hawaiian Islands. There, American labor and industry is now fighting, backed to the wall, against industrial and business annihilation.

Why cannot Japanese and Americans intermingle in the various ramifications of life profitably and peaceably? Racial differences will not permit. And this is no fault of the Japanese. It is simply History repeating. It is contended by some that social and industrial assimilation is possible. Experience in this regard in the Hawaiian Islands and the Pacific Slope has proven otherwise. In theory amalgamation is sometimes advanced as possible. Experience refuses to concur in the theory. Many who advocate

assimilation as possible, reject amalgamation as possible. However, History and experience teach us that assimilation is impossible whenever amalgamation is impossible.

The economic effects of Japanese immigration and competition are apparent to the naked eye. The Japanese, because of their training, work for less and live with less than Americans. To successfully compete with American business and labor they continue to so work and live. The result is that the Japanese have invaded and supplanted Americans in many walks of life, thereby assisting in that degree in forcing upon the American workers—unemployment.

Such, in brief, is the situation. Of course many efforts to solve the question are being made by well-intended forces and otherwise, unable to grasp the true significance of the situation. Japanese in Japan would not welcome industrial competition by American workers with a system tending to undermine established conditions. They would not welcome American immigration and competition for the reasons mentioned herein as well as other reasons. Such a position is taken by Americans in the United States. The situation does not exist interchangeable in practice because Japan happens not to afford industrial opportunity for American workers as does the United States for Japanese workers. However, human nature is quite the same the world over and did an interchangeable situation exist the Japanese would take the identical position now taken by Americans and would be justified in so doing.

Positive Asiatic Exclusion Legislation and strict enforcement of same coupled with a mutual increasing realization of the fact that the two races cannot successfully intermingle and progress, will in a large degree tend to solve the unfortunate state of affairs now existing, for the eventual welfare and happiness of both the Japanese and American people.

AMERICA AND RACE PROBLEMS.

By The Rev. C. F. Aked, D. D., LL. D.

We have more than one race problem upon our hands, and Japan ought to sympathize with us. We have not yet shown ourselves able to cope successfully with the race issues already presented to us. We have the Negro question. The curse of slavery is not wholly blotted out. Some effects remain. In the providence of God it has been ordained that no man can put a chain round his brother's ankle without finding sooner or later the other end of the chain round his own neck. Negro slavery was not originally sought by the American people. It was forced upon the Southland. Later the South acquiesced in its existence and sought to maintain it. South and North have made, are making, will continue to make, heroic and splendid efforts to meet in a spirit of righteousness all the difficulties which the past has handed down to the present. But there it is; the adjustment is not yet made. There are problems to solve; there are questions to answer; there are difficulties to be met; there are wrongs to put right. And we may be forgiven if we say that we do not want another race question thrust upon us. I am not suggesting that there is no difference between Africans brought here as slaves and Asiatics coming here as free immigrants. There is a difference. But the fact remains that the one constitutes for us a difficulty great enough. We do not want another.

Yet we have another. We have many others. There are masses of unassimilated foreigners amongst us, and these, unless we are both wise and lucky, may lower the standard of American living.

Streams of immigrant blood have brought health and wealth to the American body politic. Streams of immigrant blood have brought disease and poverty as well. Immigration is both an asset and a menace. All the world knows with what incredible success America does receive the millions from the Old World, how she makes Americans of them, and how they become a part of—an integral and infinitely valuable part of—the American stock. Yet we in America know that the success is not complete. The task is so gigantic that it may strain all American resources of nerve and brain, American institutions, and the American love of liberty. Put it at the best, assuring ourselves as we well may that America is not going to fail

in this task of assimilating the millions from the Old World, it is at least clear that America has just about as much as she can do. It is admitted that the task which we have already set ourselves is gigantic; it is not for the good of the human race that we should deliberately make it impossible; that American institutions and American civilization should be overwhelmed and destroyed. With this view, I repeat, Japan must sympathize. What is called the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, by which Japan undertakes to prohibit the emigration of laborers from her country to American shores, is her pledge of sensible and friendly understanding.

It is probable that the time has come for the United States to take a wide view, comprehensive, statesmanlike, a new view of all these questions of immigration and of all questions of policy related to immigration, actual or possible. It is probable that the time has come when America might substitute a world-view and an American policy for local and temporary expedients. It should not be impossible to meet every difficulty with a policy satisfactory to the best mind of America, from the mind represented by the labor union to that represented by the patriot and the cosmopolitan with world-wide, universal sympathies. And this policy—whatever else it may do or fail to do—while safeguarding the people of the United States from the added difficulties of another "race question", should without doubt lift the ban of discrimination which now affronts the Japanese, offer to them the rights and privileges it offers to the people of other nations, and impose no restrictions which it does not impose upon the people of Great Britain or Germany, of Italy, or Russia.

Meanwhile let this be our loyal and loving message to Japan:

We recognize your splendid ability, your marvelous and mighty achievements. Your valor proved on land and sea attests a race of heroes. Your victories in the arts of civilization, in literature, in commerce, in the pursuits of peace, reveal your genius.

We condemn insolent assertions of race superiority. We refuse to discuss questions of superiority and inferiority, of higher and lower. God has made of one blood every nation to dwell on all the face of the earth. You with us are the Father's children.

We recognize your mission as harmonizer of East and

West. You have to interpret the one to the other. We have taken our law from Rome, our art from Greece, our religion from the Jew. The English have been the colonizers. God has called America to teach liberty to mankind. And it may be that our Father in heaven has called Japan to harmonize eastern and western civilization to the end of the unification of the world.

We sincerely desire your friendship. Our professions are not mere words. We accept your professions of friendship at their face value. We believe you mean what you say. We mean what we say. We wish to live in amity with you. We wish to strive with you only in the healthy rivalries of peace and to be friends with you on land and sea.

We condemn the insulting policies of shortsighted and selfish politicians amongst us. We have ourselves no part in them. We believe that they are mistaken where they are not vicious and vicious where they are not mistaken.

We declare that it is our intention to oppose these policies everywhere, and to do all that lies in our power to defeat them. We have good reason at the present moment for believing that in California a check has been placed upon these sinister movements and that you are likely to hear less of them in the coming days. We have reason for saying that a better spirit is obtaining and wiser counsel prevailing.

And we publicly pledge ourselves, now and in the coming years, to seek to influence our fellow citizens, the men and women of the United States, to the end that all racial antagonism shall be done away, and that America at least shall live as befits a people who proclaim the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.



